

**Appl. No. 0/964,307
Amdt. dated August 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 9, 2005**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated May 9, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) objected to the specification; 2) rejected claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph and 3) rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McGuire (U.S. Pat. No. 6,816,897). With this Response, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14, 18-20 and canceled claims 2-4, 8-10, 15-17 and 21-22. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe this case to be in condition for allowance.

The § 112, second paragraph rejection of the claims that have not been canceled has been addressed by way of amendment.

Applicants amend claim 1 to require "determining from among a plurality of servers which of said other servers includes configuration data suitable for use by the server to be configured." McGuire does not teach or suggest identifying from among a plurality of other servers a particular server that contains suitable configuration data for configuring a server to be configured. Instead, McGuire teaches the support network 31 providing the required configurations and not by determining which server from among a plurality of possible servers has suitable configuration data. McGuire does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 1. At least for this reason, claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Applicants amend claim 7 to specify that "said installed server configuring itself by submitting a request for configuration data to said first chassis communication module which identifies from among a plurality of other servers a server that contains configuration data suitable for said installed server and automatically retrieves and provides said configuration data to said installed server." McGuire does not teach or suggest identifying from among a plurality of other servers a particular server that contains suitable configuration data for configuring an installed server. Instead, McGuire teaches the support network 31 providing the required configurations and not by determining which server from among a plurality of possible servers has suitable configuration data. McGuire

Appl. No. 0/964,307
Amdt. dated August 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 9, 2005

does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 7. At least for this reason, claim 7 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Claim 14 has been amended similarly to claim 7 and thus is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 7. All claims dependent from claim 14 are thus also allowable.

With regard to claim 23, Applicants do not find in McGuire a teaching of being able to specify automatic or manual configuration for a server and configuring the server in accordance with the type of configuration technique so specified. McGuire does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 23. For at least this reason, claim 23 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400